DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 120 EC 303 931

AUTHOR Hegler, Kay Loomis
TITLE The "What, Why, How, and If" of Inclusion Processes in Rural Schools: Supporting Teachers during Attitude and Teaching Behavior Change.
PUB DATE 6 Apr 95
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (73rd, Indianapolis, IN, April 5-9, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Attitude Change; *Change Strategies; Elementary Education; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Inclusive Schools; Inservice Teacher Education; Intervention; Mainstreaming; *Mild Disabilities; Pilot Projects; Program Effectiveness; *Rural Education; Social Integration; Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This study examined attitudes toward inclusive education among rural educators serving students with mild disabilities, with attention to the effectiveness of three models to promote attitude change. The three interventions assessed were a 1-day inservice meeting followed by a pilot inclusion project during the academic year; a graduate course meeting weekly for 12 weeks; and a week-long intensive graduate course. Elementary school practitioners (n=181) completed a Teacher/Administrator Attitude Questionnaire before and after the staff education interventions. Staff (n=13) involved in the pilot inclusion project completed a Collaborative Teaming Questionnaire. Elementary school students (n=33) with special needs also completed a questionnaire, Feelings about Self, to measure social integration at school. For the staff members, each of the three intervention strategies was found to be effective in promoting positive attitude change about inclusive education. Student responses indicated agreement with inclusive practices as well as resource room or pull-out practices. The three questionnaires are appended. Four tables showing survey results are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 383 120

The "What, Why, How, and If" of Inclusion Processes in Rural Schools: Supporting Teachers During Attitude and Teaching Behavior Change

A Paper Presented at
The Council for Exceptional Children
Annual Conference
April 6, 1995
Indianapolis, Indiana

Kay Loomis Hegler
Doane College
Crete, Nebraska 68333
402-826-8208
<khegler@doane.edu>

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kay Loomis Hegler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC303931

The "What, Why, How, and If" of Inclusion Processes in Rural Schools: Supporting Teachers During Attitude and Teaching Behavior Change

The transformation of services to students with special needs from isolated settings to inclusive classrooms is part of virtually every contemporary school. School administrators, board members, faculty, parents of students with special needs, and district patrons are trying to define inclusion for their own schools. Beyond definition, all teachers are being asked to change their day-to-day instructional routines. The present study examined changes in teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education practices and student attitudes toward inclusive practices. As with any change or innovation, there are persons excited about the benefits of inclusive practices, and there are persons resistant to them. This study focused on attitudes toward inclusion since a receptive attitude about the innovation facilitates the change process.

What Is Inclusion?

For the purpose of this study, several components are identified as being essential to an "inclusive school." These components are 1) collaborative teaching between general educators and special educators, 2) administrative support for inclusive practices, 3) use of a problem solving model by administrators, teachers, and all support staff, 4) similar proportion of children with special needs in each class, 5) parental involvement, 6) equality of opportunity with minimal side effects to any student, 7) students enrolled in neighborhood schools, 8) age-appropriate classmates, 9) appropriate support services to the general educator teaching children/youth with special needs, 10) a continuum of service options available, and 11) one educational system administratively and instructionally.

This study took place in Nebraska. The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) provides two relevant definitions of inclusion. First, *Inclusive education practices incorporate the belief and practice of including and educating all children in their neighborhood school within the general education program.* Second, *inclusion is the provision of educational services for students with disabilities in schools with non-disabled peers, in age-appropriate general education classes under the direct supervision of general education teachers, with special education support and assistance as determined through the individualized educational planning process.* These definitions are available to all school districts in a NDE Reference Document on *Neighborhood Schools and Inclusive Education Practices.* The preparation and distribution of this reference document is an indicator of the intense amount of state-wide professional interest and potential for change.

Why Use Inclusive Practices?

While this study was in process, I was asked by a secondary teacher, "Why can't we just send 'these kids,' the ones with severe impairment, off to some school away from here?" That question expressed most directly and strongly, the often covert resentment about inclusive services to students with special needs at any level of involvement. Another classroom teacher expressed legitimate frustration about the challenge to adapt and individualize for a group of intermediate grade students, even though this group consisted of all "non-verified" at risk students and "regular" students. Teacher belief systems based on serving a traditional and homogeneous ability population, and administrative expectations to provide services without support for the single general education teacher require many approaches to create value for an inclusive education system.

Legal Support

All branches of our government support inclusion. Nationally, PL 94-142 and IDEA contain the legislative framework for inclusive services. Case law initiated by parents and other advocates for persons with disabilities has resulted in judicial rulings in favor of inclusive education practices. The executive branch through state departments of education and publications like the NDE Reference Document *Neighborhood Schools and Inclusive Education Practices* make decisions supporting this on-going trend.

Case Examples of Social Benefits

The experiences of teachers who are using inclusive practices also increase the relevancy of inclusive practices. I was recently in a kindergarten classroom observing students asking for the privilege of pushing a peer's wheelchair to the bus during a common dismissal time. The student with the disability is able to respond non-verbally to his peers, to join in parallel play at the Lego center, to punch in the digits of his home phone number, and to listen attentively during story time. Although modifications in his instructions will need to be increased throughout his school career, his peers have a foundation experience of acceptance and appreciation for the achievements he will make. The child has learned to interact with age-appropriate peers without disturbing them. All students in this example have experienced social benefits from an inclusive education model.

In another setting, a girl with Down syndrome was in her third year in an inclusive cohort, extending from kindergarten, through second grade. A second grader from another district joined the class and was observed to be teasing the student with special needs during recess. Before the teacher could intervene, two of the girl's classmates, both young boys, told the new boy that no one was allowed to talk to the girl like that. This case provides a second demonstration of the social benefits available to all students through inclusive education practices.

These two examples illustrate the social benefits that extend to students with and without special needs during inclusive education. One method frequently used by teachers in inclusive settings in cooperative learning. In cooperative learning, the emphasis on collaborative goals does promote the attainment of social skills for all students. The literature on cooperative learning also documents increased academic achievement for all learners. A cooperative group structure offers an effective model for inclusion.

Inclusive education practices typically increase the amount of parental involvement from all parents. As general education students tell their parents about all the students in the classroom, those parents become more interested in the school. They call to ask about class placement, listen to ways schools are meeting the needs of all learners, and support a variety of activities. Recently, a school community showed support for a student attending the national Special Olympics by participating in a spaghetti dinner netting over $700 for the student's travel expenses. Parents of general education students were involved in the dinner preparation as well as the large turnout of approximately 300 people. Inclusion does provide ways for members of the community to support each other.

The Least Restrictive Environment

While inclusive education practices actualize the basic concept of the least restrictive environment, a continuum of services is necessary. Some students cannot achieve their maximum potential in a general education classroom, even with intensive support. Inclusive education practices begin with the assumption that support services are attempted by degrees, moving only one step at a time from general education to general education with push-in support, to an array of short-term pull-out services through more intensive services of special classes, day schools, or residential facilities.

How Are Inclusive Services Provided?

A basic belief underlying this study was that we educators have all the knowledge and skills to provide inclusive education. The techniques, strategies, methods, and models of instruction used effectively in general education are not distinctly different and separate from those used to instruct students with special needs. Additionally, we as a single group of educators must modify our attitudes towards inclusive services. It is our readiness to modify, adjust, revise, and refine, each time adapting to our student's needs, learning styles and ability level that makes education for all students effective, regardless of the environment.

This study examined attitudes towards inclusive education practices, with emphasis on the effectiveness of three different models for presenting information about inclusive education to

current practitioners in order to promote changes in their attitudes toward inclusive education practices. The results are presented for consideration by professionals in a variety of school settings seeking to develop teachers' attitudes toward inclusive education.

Method

Assessment Attitudes toward Inclusion and Three Models to Impact Change in Teacher's Attitude

The first model included a one day inservice meeting with a facilitator from outside of the district. The district is a rural district with approximately 30 certified staff members K - 6. Following the inservice meeting, three teams each composed of a general educator and a special educator were formed to pilot inclusion during the 1993-1994 school year. The second model for promotion of inclusive education included a semester long graduate course with weekly sessions for twelve weeks. The third model was a week long intensive graduate course with five consecutive daily sessions, 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM. The professor for each of the sessions was the same.

Selection of Participants

In the rural school district, all professional teachers and administrators in the elementary level building participated by completing the Teacher/Administrator Attitude Questionnaire. The three teams involved in the pilot inclusion project also completed a Collaborative Teaming Questionnaire. All elementary students verified as eligible to receive special education services completed a questionnaire, Feelings about Self, as a measure of the students with special needs social integration into the life of the school.

The graduate students were all currently teaching in either regular education or special education classes. All were voluntarily taking a course entitled Collaborative Teaching - An Inclusion Model. This course was an elective course in a Master of Education degree program.

These practitioners are representative of K - 12 teachers in rural districts. There was no selection of participants in the first model, inservice and implementation. The practitioners completing the questionnaire for the second and third models were all candidates for an MEd. They may have taken the course for any one of at least three reasons: 1) They were engaged in more inclusive practices, and they wanted information. 2) The graduate student wanted an elective, and selected this one because the dates and location were convenient. 3) They were interested in information on a current topic in education.

Questionnaire Development

The three questionnaires were jointly developed by the local school elementary principal and the college professor. Both were interested in strategies to effectively increase teacher's knowledge, attitude, and skills about inclusive education practices.

The questionnaires were revised during and between work sessions until both researchers were satisfied with the final product. The initial draft of the Teacher/Administrator Attitude Questionnaire was developed from statements about inclusion in current literature. No one source was more influential than another. The questionnaires are found in Appendices 1 - 3. Persons interested in the reliability of the data presented from this study are encouraged to replicate the study with new groups of teachers using these questionnaires.

The researchers decided to seek information from three groups in the implementation school. The attitudes of the entire staff were important to the building principal. Equally important to him were the attitudes of those teachers in the collaborative teams and the perceptions of the students involved in the inclusion practices. The primary investigator was able to gather responses from individual teachers in her graduate classes. Since few of the graduate students were members of collaborative inclusion teams, it was not possible to seek completion of the Collaborative Teaming questionnaire or the Feelings about Self questionnaire completed by elementary students in inclusive settings.

Questionnaire Distribution and Completion

Teacher/Administrator Attitude. There were twenty completed questionnaires by the teachers in the first model using inservice followed by pilot implementation during the pre-implementation phase. There were fourteen completed by this group in the post-implementation phase. These questionnaires were distributed by the principal at staff meetings and the teachers were asked to return them. Actual completion was voluntary and confidential.

There were twelve graduate students in the semester long course meeting one evening per week for twelve weeks. Each of the twelve students completed a questionnaire at the beginning and at the end of the course. No student added this course late or dropped it during the term.

There were sixty-one students completing the attitude questionnaire in the pre-implementation phase for the one week long summer term courses. Because of a late enrollment, sixty-two graduate students completed the questionnaire at the end of the course. There were two sections of this graduate course.

The graduate students in both the semester long course and the one week intensive summer course were all current practitioners. Of the practitioners in both time frames, 55 were

full time classroom teachers and one was a substitute teacher. The teaching assignments of these practitioners included general education assignments in primary, middle, and secondary grades, special education assignments, and related services assignments such as speech/language therapy.

This yielded a total of 181 questionnaires for all groups, both pre and post implementation.

Collaborative Teaming Questionnaire. There were three grade level teams established. The questionnaire was distributed to all professional staff involved. Thirteen completed questionnaires were returned. This included two "resource teachers," one teacher of English as a second language, two special education teachers with a self-contained classroom whose students were mainstreamed into "special classes" such as music, PE, and art, seven general education teachers, and one building administrator.

Student Questionnaire - Feelings about Self. This questionnaire was distributed and gathered just once, at the end of the school year with the pilot inclusive classes. Thirty-six students completed this questionnaire, either by dictating their comments to a teacher or a paraprofessional, or by writing their responses themselves. Thirty-three of the questionnaires were scorable.

Results

The Teacher/Administrator Questionnaire had thirty statements. Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with each statement on a five-point likert scale. The attitudes of all the teachers and administrators moved in the desired direction, that is they become statistically more significantly accepting of inclusion practices, on twenty-one of the thirty items. Table 1 displays the label for each of the twenty-one significant items. The level of significance is noted.

The responses on the Collaborative Teaming Questionnaire are presented in Table 2. The responses for each of the ten items are presented by percentage of responses in each category.

A two-way interaction analysis of variance procedure was completed to review the data for differences according to intervention to promote changes in attitude toward inclusive education. There was one significant difference; this was at item 29, reading "For children with severe needs, learning for academic goals is more important that learning for social goals." While the responses of the one day inservice with year long implementation teachers increased, the responses of the graduate students/practitioners in the week long intensive course decreased. The analysis of variance two-way interaction values are displayed in Table 3. It is also important to note that the responses to item 29 were not significantly changed from the pre-

intervention to post-intervention measure. This fact seems to negate consideration of the difference among intervention group scores.

The responses on the Student Questionnaire - Feelings about Self are displayed in Table 4, according to the percentage of responses in each category for each of the first nine items. The spontaneous sentence stem completion statements from students contain many responses that are illegible or not pertinent to this study. For example, several responses asked for air conditioning; these were determined to be non-responsive. Four questionnaires had responses to item 10 of use to this study. Item 10 reads "Some things I would like to change about my classes..." Two purposeful responses were written by an assisting adult. Both responses are the same: "Kids who make fun of me." In irregular manuscript and labored cursive, two other responses state: a) "that people wode (would) not get yeald (yelled) at for stepid (stupid) things and the tearsches (teachers) favs (favorites) some to get in truble (trouble) to not gest kids." and b) "I want friends to be nice to me."

Discussion

Teacher/Administrator Attitude Questionnaire

Of the twenty-one items significantly changed in the direction of supporting more inclusion, eight were significant at the $p = <.001$ level. These eight indicated that any one of the interventions, inservice and implementation, semester long graduate courses, or week long intensive graduate course format can 1) provide sufficient amounts of information about disabilities, 2) build confidence building in teacher's abilities to adequately modify instruction, 3) create an attitude of anticipation for collaborative teaching, 4) increase teachers' recognition of the similarities of all students, 5) increase recognition of academic learning by all students, 6) enhance acknowledgement of the social benefits achieved in inclusive settings, 7) confirm for teachers that IEP goals and objectives can be achieved through regular class instruction, and 8) lead to an expanded definition of collaborative teaching.

Of the twenty-one items significantly changed in the direction of supporting more inclusion, nine were significant at the $p = <.01$ level. At the post-intervention, responses to the Teacher/Administrator Attitude Questionnaire indicated the capacity of the described interventions to 1) develop teacher recognition that all students can learn, 2) help teachers experience the joy of teaching students with special needs, 3) encourage teachers to establish behavior guidelines appropriate to all students, 4) increase teacher readiness to support the social integration of students with special needs, 5) bring to focus the acceptance of students with special needs by general education students, 6) have teachers notice the ways regular class participation can enhance the self concept of students with

special needs, 7) develop teacher awareness that with support they can teach regular education students and students with special needs in the same classroom, 8) confirm for teachers that students with special education can earn passing grades in regular classrooms, and 9) be recognized by teachers as supplying information about students with special needs.

The remaining four items, of the 21 items with a statistically significant change toward more inclusive attitudes, are significant at the $p = <.05$ level. These data indicated that any one of the interventions can 1) support teachers as they try various strategies for students with special needs, 2) expand teacher recognition that learning and teaching are interactive processes, 3) help teachers to recognize what content is appropriate or is not appropriate for students with special needs, and 4) clearly identify past co-teaching experiences.

Differences in Change By Model/Time Frame

As described in the results section, there was only one item of thirty questionnaire items with significant difference among the three intervention models. Since this one item did not have a significant change from the pre-intervention to the post-intervention measure, the significant difference among the groups is negated. This combined set of data supports the use of any one of the three interventions to promote change in teachers' and/or administrators' attitudes toward inclusive education practices.

Collaborative Teaming Questionnaire

Of the ten items, positive interpretations are presented for two. A total of 69.2% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed that the staff share a common language about instructional technologies. A commonly understood language is vital to effective communication. The rate of agreement on this item may serve as a foundation for future problem-solving about concerns identified in this study.

A total of 76.9%, nearly 4 out of 5, of the staff members strongly agreed and agreed that the staff learn from and with each other. Since teachers have opportunities to model life-long learning, and since any change process requires receiving and processing of new information, the high level of agreement on this item is positive. The responding staff members perceive they have learned from each other in the past and might be expected to be receptive to joint learning experiences.

Since this study defines collaborative teaching as an element of inclusive teaching, the responses to item 2 offer an area of growth for this district. Of the respondents, 77% strongly disagreed or disagreed that the staff often observe each other in their classrooms and give feedback on instruction. Although the feedback may be informal, the opportunities to provide encouragement to colleagues through collaborative teaching may be

missed unless this skill is intentionally developed. Since teaching has been described as a "cellular" activity, this area of growth opportunity is predicted for more districts than just the district participating in this study. Teachers need additional preparation to mentor and peer coach each other.

Joint planning time is a function of collaborative teaching. Of the respondents, 77% strongly disagreed or disagreed with item 10, indicating they do not believe the staff have joint time specifically provided for planning and problem solving. An area of challenge for all members of the professional staff is to find this time.

A third area of growth potential is that 69.2% are undecided, disagreed, or strongly disagreed about item 3 rating staff discussion about instructional techniques and methods in the workroom lounge; this is coupled with the responses to item 9 in which none of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the staff lounge/workroom discussions center mostly on instructional practices rather than on social concerns or complaints about learners. The administrators and teachers may use a problem solving model to determine what atmosphere is desired in the faculty/staff lounge, and then decide on strategies to achieve this atmosphere.

Student Questionnaire Feelings about Self

As the items on the Student Questionnaire - Feelings about Self are examined, items 1, 2, 3, and 7 convey the tone of inclusive education practices. Items 4, 5, and 6 are in a "neutral" position on the continuum of services from fully inclusive to separate services. Items 8 and 9 may be perceived as more supportive of pull-out, resource, or separate service provision to students with special needs.

Student responses on items 1, 2, 3, and 7 imply positive feelings toward inclusive education practices. Of the respondents, 84.8% strongly agreed or agreed that they like the variety of students in their classes. Of the responding students, 72.8% strongly agreed or agreed that they liked working and studying with everybody in their class. Of the respondents, 72.7% strongly agreed or agreed that they have friends in every class. Finally, 51.5% strongly agreed or agreed that they get together with friends from their classes after school.

Students responded with high levels of agreement to those statements in more neutral positions. Instruction in small groups may be provided in the general education classroom or in the resource room. Approximately 79% (78.8%)strongly agreed or agreed that they learn best in small groups. Regardless of instructional setting, 84.8% strongly agreed or agreed that they could ask their teacher(s) for extra help. Nearly 70% (69.7%) responded that they could ask their friends for extra help.

On the first of two items reflecting a less inclusive position, 18.2% of students reported getting nervous when they had to leave their classroom and 48.5% expressed a wish to be taken out of their classroom more often then the existing schedule permitted to get more individual help. Since the students have been used to receiving extra help outside of the classroom, they may perceive that they have to leave the general education classroom to get extra help, OR they may recognize their own need for a quieter environment with fewer distractions as often provided in the resource room setting.

If You Want to Promote Inclusive Education

A basic premise of this study stated that a change in teacher attitude is essential in order to promote more inclusive education practices in PK-12 schools. The results of this study indicate that inservice education followed by pilot implementation of inclusive practices, semester long graduate courses, and one week intensive summer graduate courses are all effective strategies to result in this attitude change.

The one day inservice meeting did include five hours of lecture style presentation by an external consultant noted in the area for inclusion expertise. The collaborative inclusion teams were formed following this inservice day. Participation in the pilot inclusion teams was voluntary. The administration was encouraging and supported the implementation of more inclusive practices at the elementary level. No addition funds were provided nor were any additional support personnel hired. The schedules of the general education teachers remained unchanged, while the resource teachers modified their schedules in order to provide services in the general education classes. During this pilot year, administrative support was expressed through regular formal and informal meetings to determine the areas of concern among each of the teachers participating.

During the graduate classes, the current practitioners/graduate students completed a variety of activities including a) the design of an exclusive school, b) a graphic representation of inclusion illustrating all the concepts embedded in inclusion, c) listened to a parent panel whose members told their own story as parents of students with special needs, d) evaluated those case examples in light of which child and family they could choose to deny services, e) reviewed the literature on inclusive education practices for specific classroom and school strategies, f) designed a school inclusion plan for the next academic year, and g) designated specific activities each one would do in his/her own school to promote inclusive education in the next academic year.

Summary

Three questionnaires were written, each for a different group of participants in inclusive education. One was for teachers and administrators, one was for collaborative teams, and one was for elementary level students with special needs. Three interventions for changing teacher attitudes about inclusive education were implemented. The results indicated that inservice with pilot implementation, semester long graduate courses, and week long summer intensive graduate courses are each able to significantly change attitude about inclusion. Responses on the student questionnaire implied strong agreement or agreement with inclusive practices and resource room/pull-out practices sometimes defined as less inclusive. The teacher collaborative team questionnaire identified both positive areas and areas of needed growth in the practices and routines of the participating teachers.

All of the responding teachers served students with mild disabilities, either learning disabilities, mental handicaps, or behavioral disorders. The results should be considered in the discussion of services to learners with mild disabilities. Further study using questionnaires like those developed for this study and other assessment formats are recommended regarding the use of inclusive education practices for students with moderate, severe, or profound disabilities.

Table 1

Teacher/Administration Attitude
Pre-Intervention and Post-Intervention means
for all significant items, N = 181

Item	Pre-Means	Post-Means
1. Handicapping Conditions	3.0606	3.7927***
3. Special Needs Courses	3.7475	4.2439**
4. Tried Teach Special Needs	4.2121	4.4390*
6. Can Modify for MMH	3.6364	4.0732***
7. Joy of Teaching	4.1616	4.4512**
8. Learn/teach Active Processes	4.5556	4.7195*
9. Look forward Collaborative	3.8788	4.3171***
10. Discipline Guidelines	3.6970	4.0610**
13. Special Like Regular	3.8586	4.3537***
14. All Learn from Special	3.8081	4.2683***
16. Grade Not Adaptable	2.1111	1.8171*
17. Can Be Integrated	4.0202	4.2683**
18. Students will Accept	3.6768	4.0244**
21. Self Concepts Built	3.6364	4.0488**
22. Integration is Benefit	4.0404	4.4390***
23. Planned Goals in Class	3.6768	4.1220***
24. Regular and Special Same Class	3.9697	4.2927**
25. Collaborative Teaching	4.4242	4.7683***
26. Have Co-Taught	3.3636	3.8415*
27. Specials Can Pass	3.9697	4.3902**
28. Inservice Training	3.3232	3.8415**

* Sig < .05
** Sig < .01
*** Sig < .001

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Collaborative Work Environment Items for Inclusive Teams, N = 13

Item	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)
1. Common Language	15.4	53.8	7.7	15.4	7.7
2. Observe & Feedback	7.7	--	15.4	30.8	46.2
3. Discuss Instructional Techniques	7.7	23.1	30.8	30.8	7.7
4. Work Together	7.7	38.5	15.4	30.8	7.7
5. Design Educational Material	7.7	30.8	23.1	15.4	23.1
6. Share Resources	7.7	30.8	30.8	23.1	7.7
7. Learn From One Another	15.4	61.5	15.4	7.7	--
8. Time Staff Meetings	7.7	--	15.4	76.9	--
9. Lounge Discussion	--	--	53.8	46.2	--
10. Time to Problem Solve		7.7	15.4	30.8	46.2

Table 3

Analysis of Variance
Two Way Interactions
Pre/Post Test
Teacher/Administration Attitude

Item	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean-Square	F	Signif Of F
1. Disability	.746	2	.373	.390	.678
2. All Can Learn	.057	2	.028	.075	.928
3. Special Needs Courses	.201	2	.100	.078	.925
4. Tried Teach Special Needs	.593	2	.296	.593	.554
5. All Can Learn to Learn	.057	2	.029	.052	.949
6. Can Modify for Disability	1.291	2	.646	.776	.462
7. Joy of Teaching	1.841	2	.921	1.515	.223
8. Learn Teach Active Processes	.701	2	.351	1.333	.226
9. Look Forward Collaborative	.245	2	.122	.171	.843
10. Discipline Guidelines	1.754	2	.877	1.235	.293
11. Strategies Effective All	2.234	2	1.117	.907	.405
12. Negative Stigmas	1.251	2	.625	.731	.483
13. Special Like Regular	1.153	2	.577	1.046	.354
14. All Learn From Special	.583	2	.292	.465	.629
15. Teachers Effective All	.540	2	.270	.268	.765
16. Grade Not Adaptable	1.118	2	.559	.578	.562
17. Can Be Integrated	.258	2	.129	.271	.763
18. Students Will Accept	.232	2	.116	.186	.831
19. Impact of Expectations	.050	2	.025	.072	.931
20. Learn From Others	.072	2	.036	.138	.871
21. Self Concept Built	.276	2	.138	.148	.863
22. Integration Is Benefit	.961	2	.480	.803	.450
23. Planned Goals in Class	.279	2	.140	.210	.811
24. Reg and Spec. Same Class	.386	2	.193	.330	.719
25. Collaborative Teaching	.639	2	.320	1.255	.288
26. Have Co-Taught	.267	2	.133	.067	.935
27. Specials Can Pass	.412	2	.206	.231	.794
28. Inservice Training	3.616	2	1.808	1.190	.307
29. Academic vs. Social Goals	4.961	2	2.481	3.121	.047
30. Special Best with Special	2.115	2	1.057	1.038	.356

Table 4

Frequency Distribution of Feelings about Self Questionnaire Items for Students, N=33

Item	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)
1. Variety in Class	33.3	51.5	12.1	3	--
2. Work With Everybody	45.5	27.3	18.2	6.1	3
3. Friends in Class	48.5	24.2	6.1	15.2	6.1
4. Learn in Small Groups	45.5	33.3	18.2	--	3.0
5. Ask Teacher for Help	54.5	30.3	15.2	--	--
6. Ask Students for Help	33.3	36.4	18.2	9.1	3.0
7. After School with Friends	21.2	30.3	18.2	9.1	21.2
8. Nervous When Leave Class	9.1	9.1	15.2	15.2	51.5
9. Individual Help	18.2	30.3	18.2	15.2	18.2

Appendix 1

Teacher/Administrator Questionnaire
Inclusion

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information about your knowledge of, attitudes toward, and skills for serving students with special needs.

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following items by circling the appropriate number. Use the five point rating scale listed here.

5 = Strongly agree
4 = Agree
3 = Undecided
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly Disagree

5 4 3 2 1 1. I have adequate knowledge about the various handicapping conditions.

5 4 3 2 1 2. All students can learn.

5 4 3 2 1 3. I have had college/university courses about students with special needs.

5 4 3 2 1 4. I have tried teaching techniques to vary instruction for students with special needs.

5 4 3 2 1 5. All students can learn how to learn.

5 4 3 2 1 6. I can effectively modify instructional techniques for teaching the mildly mentally handicapped student in my classroom.

5 4 3 2 1 7. I have experienced the "joy of teaching" when working with regular students and students with special needs.

5 4 3 2 1 8. Learning and teaching are active processes. interactive one with the other.

5 4 3 2 1 9. I look forward to collaborative teaching.

5 4 3 2 1 10. My classroom discipline/management guidelines are appropriate to all learners, including the mentally handicapped, behaviorally, disordered,and learning disabled.

5 4 3 2 1 11. Effective teaching strategies are effective with all students.

5 4 3 2 1 12. Negative stigmas attached to labels can be eliminated.

5 4 3 2 1 13. Students with special needs are more like "regular" students than not like them.

5 4 3 2 1 14. When I have successfully adopted methods and materials for a student with learning disabilities, I notice that all my students learn.

5 4 3 2 1 15. Effective teachers are effective with all students.

5 4 3 2 1 16. At my grade level, the content of the curricula is not adaptable for students with special needs.

5 4 3 2 1 17. Students with special needs can be socially integrated into the mainstream school environment.

5 4 3 2 1 18. Regular students will accept students with special needs if all are involved in like-age classrooms.

5 4 3 2 1 19. Teacher expectations have a powerful impact on student achievment and reaching potential.

5 4 3 2 1 20. Students learn from others.

5 4 3 2 1 21. Students with special needs build and maintain positive self concepts in regular classroom environments.

5 4 3 2 1 22. Integration for social goals is a benefit of including students with special needs in the regular classroom.

5 4 3 2 1 23. Goals and objectives from an individual education plan can be achieved through regular classroom instruction.

5 4 3 2 1 24. With support, I could teach regular and special needs students in the same classroom or instructional group.

5 4 3 2 1 25. Collaborative teaching includes joint planning, presenting, and assessing of lessons and student achievement.

5 4 3 2 1 26. I have co-taught lessons in the past.

5 4 3 2 1 27. Students with special needs can earn passing grades in my classroom.

5 4 3 2 1 28. I have attended and participated in inservice training about serving all students through workshops or teacher visitations.

5 4 3 2 1 29. For children with severe needs, learning for academic goals is more important than learning for social goals.

5 4 3 2 1 30. Children with special needs learn best when grouped with other children of special needs.

Appendix 2

Name
Position
Level/Unit

Instructions: The norms for staff behavior listed below are those frequently found in collaborative work environments in schools. Please read each statement carefully. Then rate the degree to which each statement reflects the current work environment in your school with the scale listed below.

5 = Strongly agree
4 = Agree
3 = Undecided
2 = Disagree
1 = Strongly disagree

5 4 3 2 1 1. The staff share a common language about instructional technologies.

5 4 3 2 1 2. The staff often observe each other in their classrooms and give feedback on instruction.

5 4 3 2 1 3. The staff frequently discuss instructional techniques and methods in the workroom lounge.

5 4 3 2 1 4. The staff work together to master new instructional materials together.

5 4 3 2 1 5. The staff plan and design educational materials together.

5 4 3 2 1 6. The staff pool their expertise and share their resources with each other.

5 4 3 2 1 7. The staff learn from and with each other.

5 4 3 2 1 8. Time is specifically devoted at staff meetings to demonstrate and discuss innovative educational techniques, materials, or strategies.

5 4 3 2 1 9. Discussions in the staff lounge/workroom center mostly on instructional practices rather than on social concerns or complaints about learners.

5 4 3 2 1 10. Time is specifically provided for professional staff to plan and problem solve together.

Please add your comments about Collaborative Teaming on the back.

Appendix 3

Student Questionnaire
Feelings about Self

Please circle the number that tells us how much you agree with the sentence. Read the ways you can agree, from full agreement to no agreement. After you read the sentence, think about your answer, then circle the number that tells how you agree.

Circle 5 = if you agree strongly
4 = if you agree
3 = if you are not sure
2 = if you disagree
1 = if you agree strongly

Remember, 5 is the most agreement and 1 is no agreement.

5 4 3 2 1 1. I like the variety of students in my class.

5 4 3 2 1 2. I like working and studying with everybody in my class.

5 4 3 2 1 3. I have friends in every class.

5 4 3 2 1 4. I learn best in small groups.

5 4 3 2 1 5. I can ask my teacher(s) for extra help.

5 4 3 2 1 6. I can ask other students for extra help.

5 4 3 2 1 7. I get together with friends from my classes after school.

5 4 3 2 1 8. I get nervous when I have to leave my classroom.

5 4 3 2 1 9. I wish I could be taken out of my classroom more often to get more individual help.

Finish these sentences, please.

10. Some things I would like to change about my classes

11. What I like best about learning in my classes is

12. What I still don't understand about my classes is

13. What I want you to know about me is

Collaborative Team Work Environment Self-assessment